

THE PROTESTANT

Editor

KENNETH LESLIE

Associate Editors

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS

JOHN HAMMOND

GERALD RICHARDSON

Editorial Secretary

KATHERINE KASTOREA

Distribution Manager

SANFORD ARCHIBALD

Editorial Advisers

RUTH NANDA ANSHEN
LEE H. BALL
RUSSELL C. BARBOUR
C. HARRISON BECKER
ADAM BHILIPPOVSKY
G. A. BORGESE
DWIGHT J. BRADLEY
OTTO BRAND
HENRIETTA BUCKMASTER
R. ALEX CAMERON
GEORGE CONNER
BOISE DENT
JOSEPH F. FLETCHER
PAUL J. FOLINO
ERWIN A. GAEDE
PAUL N. GARBER
H. M. GOOCH
A. EUSTACE HAYDON

CHESTER E. HODGSON
DANIEL HUGHES
EDWIN H. HUGHES
HEWLETT JOHNSON
J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR.
FREDERICK D. KERSHNER
STANTON LAUTENSCHLAGER
JOHN A. LEE
B. B. COMER LILE
DAVID LORD
DONALD LOTHROP
JOHN MACMURRAY
H. D. A. MAJOR
ANTONIO MANGANO
JOHN A. F. MAYNARD
FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL
JOSEPH G. MOORE

ROBERT H. NICHOLS
JOSEPH NOVOTNY
DRYDEN L. PHELPS
HAROLD C. PHILLIPS
A. CLAYTON POWELL
IDA PRUIT
TRACY M. PULLMAN
LESLIE ROBERTS
RAYMOND ROBINS
D. R. SHARPE
ALFRED STIERNOTTE
WATSON THOMSON
GREGORY VLASTOS
O. WALTER WAGNER
WILFRED WAKEFIELD
RUFUS W. WEAVER
HENRY N. WIEMAN

Vol. VII

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1947

No. 9

TRUMAN AND THE POPE

Editorial by OTTO BRAND

I feel certain that our readers must have been much disturbed to read not only the correspondence between our President and the Pope, but more particularly the dispatch from Rome which bears all the earmarks of Vatican inspiration. I refer to the publication in the *Times* of August 30th.

May I briefly voice the indignation I am sure we all feel.

You will recall that in my recent letter to Sumner Welles I intimated that in this unauthorized relationship this country need not expect any concession from the Vatican without making one of equal importance in return. Mr. Welles assured me that this would not be. Yet immediately after that came the announcement that the Roman Catholic religion, by consent of the powers, was to be the State religion of Italy. [See "Open Letter to Sumner Welles," Feb.-Mar., 1947 Issue.]

And now this! Talk about "politics making strange bedfellows"! The President of our country, personally making what amounts to an alliance with the Vatican, the institution which our late President Roosevelt described as a "political entity" which, as being neutral, must be spared from bombardment.

Many people will be deceived by this correspondence. Our President and the Pope will be seen using the same terms, as for instance, "faith"; and yet each one in his heart must know that they mean something diametrically opposite.

For the conclusion of a series of summer sermons I had weeks ago prepared one entitled "God's Holy Spirit the Controlling Head of the Church." After reading that *Times* article I could not refrain from speaking out plainly to my people. I mentioned the fact that Mr. Taylor's appointment was in utter defiance of the plain intent of our Constitution and that the Federal Council of Churches had petitioned the President to discontinue it—in vain.

I added "Now he has gone very much further and in a letter published last week in our newspapers, he has concluded with the Pope of Rome what is, in effect, a political alliance which the United States Senate would never dare to approve. Mr. Truman would doubtlessly deny this was his intention. That is not the most important thing. The most important thing is *how they interpret his action in the Vatican.*"

Having now the personal backing of the American President and presumptively also that of our country, the Pope will on Sept. 7th deliver his directions to his Catholic Action group. This will be the forerunner of a drive that will go far beyond Italy's borders and will aim at reaching Catholics throughout the world. Vast quantities of reprints are to be printed and circulated. The oft-reiterated statement that our peace efforts must fail is once again stated to be the Vatican's understanding. The Vatican is prepared to do everything in its power to halt and circumscribe communism. Does that mean in the old fashioned manner of supplying even troops, to fight with American troops? The following is a revealing item in this article.

"Consequently, satisfaction is felt in Catholic circles over what is frankly stated to be, in the last analysis, an anti-Communist Crusade. In their view the OFFICIAL joining of the Catholic Church as the greatest spiritual force and the United States as the strongest lay power in the Christian world is seen as a logical sequel to the current United States policy of firmness, as embodied in the Truman Doctrine, against what is termed Russian imperialism."

The question is, HOW LONG IS AMERICA GOING TO STAND FOR IT? All Catholic Americans do not subscribe to such views. Certainly the Catholic mothers of America do not want again to have to sacrifice their sons and husbands in a worse war than the world has ever known. We must get the truth across. There must be collaboration between all of our Protestant forces, not in an anti-Catholic Crusade, but to answer the question which the *New York Times* posed long years ago, namely whether an American citizen, a priest, like Father McGlynn, could exercise his rights as an American and vote as he pleased without interference from Rome. The *Times* ventured the prophecy that the time would come when that question would have to be settled once and for all.

The time has come.

RELIGION AND THE U.S.S.R.

And Other Editorials by KENNETH LESLIE

The Soviet Union is more important to religion than to economics or politics.

It is more than possible that the people of the Soviet Union are too busy creating a new life to make a theological interpretation of it, not only too busy but too deeply immersed in the life itself. We can see the analogy among people in this country who having awakened from the long sleep of their dichotomous life are engrossed in its re-integration and, in turning against the false religion which divided their life, have turned against all religion and all symbols of religion, even the very conception of religion itself.

There has been a profound emptying out, disgorging, of the words which at one time signified the deepest meaning of life but which have for a long time constituted a means of escape from these meanings, indeed have been used to transvalue these meanings into their opposites. Many of those in our society who are striving to maintain what individuality they have and to build it stronger by referring theory to

action in ever greater areas of their contact with their world, indeed most such individuals are compelled to keep away from the ecclesiastical atmosphere as from the plague, for the reason that it is suffused with falseness from one end of it to the other. This very falseness strangely has come to be identified by many as the true mark of reverence and praise. It hollows or half strangles the very tone of the big-pulpit preacher as he addresses the Almighty in public prayer.

The invincible ignorance as to what religion means on the part of the church was recently shown in connection with the English film "Black Narcissus" which is an eloquent and beautiful attempt to convey certain religious lessons, one of which is that religion is not pietism. The pietistic nuns were taught a series of lessons as to the true nature of religion by the people of India to whom they thought they were bringing the light. Yet a Protestant guide to motion pictures misunderstands the whole thing and condemns the picture because it does not give a true picture of missions.

The church is false to its mission because the church has ceased to engage the world in battle. The church poses anti-church secularism as its enemy. But its true enemy is the secularism inside the church rather than that outside. In much of what passes for secularism outside the church is to be found the seed at least of true religion.

The church has accepted the world, but the words of hymn, prayer, scripture are words which do not accept the world; therefore they must be uttered either in the fulsome voice of hypocrisy or in the strained utterance of one side of a *divided* personality.

A ghost writer for a national body of businessmen who carry on propaganda throughout the country in favor of what they call the system of free enterprise wrote a speech for a business executive and was called on the carpet by the chief of the organization because he had in his speech mentioned with approval "the abundant life." He pointed out that the phrase was taken from the New Testament but his chief said the hell with that, it was a Roosevelt phrase and it had to come out. Actually he need not have worried about it because not only church people but all our people now are thoroughly accustomed to the use of phrases which are to be taken either not seriously or in their opposite sense. Free enterprise, for instance, means freedom to compete but of course not *compulsion* to compete. This means freedom *not* to compete which means freedom to see to it that nobody competes, which means monopoly. So Free Enterprise means Monopoly. The church is no longer the only agency of dividing the mind. The technique has spread to all the agencies which have taken over the job of the pulpit, namely, press, radio, films.

So it is that those individuals who are striving to bind up the division within their lives, to pull themselves together, to get their feet down on the ground of this planet, have felt compelled to retreat from all contact with the ritual and terminology of religion.

The task which we are striving to accomplish is the difficult one of reclaiming for these individuals not necessarily their cast-off "religion" but at least a *firm conviction of their own ultimate insight* against those who would throw them out of the ultimate categories which in the Western world are identified as religious categories.

It has been a profound mistake of Marxist fundamentalists in getting rid of a false God (liquidating a false conception of reality and of human development) to throw out the general conception of God altogether. This mistake may lead to a religious exacerbation of the economic struggle which could have been avoided. We can understand and we are trying here to understand how naturally, almost inevitably, this mistake came to be made. But it is not enough to understand this. The mistake must be rectified. There are signs that it is being rectified.

The work of Father Smyth in Cambridge, Mass., is a brilliant effort to pour into an Anglo-Catholic mold the communal and individual values so long denied by Christendom. The English group known as the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership is a larger and broader attempt along the same lines. It has produced a book of prayers for social righteousness which expresses fearlessly the revolutionary dynamic of Jesus and wars openly against "the owners and controllers of the means of

life and knowledge" who "conscript for purposes of total war the masses whom they had hitherto conscripted to produce profit for the few." Our present economic system they castigate in true prophetic style in that it "promotes mass selfishness, class-division, and international war. It is a worship of Mammon, and, as such, is a moral outrage."

It is unlikely for some time to come that the new liturgies of world communal living will be expressed in one over-all language. Meanwhile the separate liturgies will be drawn together in their expressions by their common intent and purpose. In the sense that religion has to do with the development of the life of man and of his joy in living, the enrichment of his contacts with his natural environment and with other men, above all with the integrity of man, the honesty and wholeness of man's approach to nature and to himself, and as a consequence of his honesty and wholeness, his growing freedom, the Soviet way of life, far from perfected yet constantly being improved, has the biggest thing to say since Jesus brought the Sadducees face to face with *their* divided lives.

In the Soviet Union there is a sincere effort for the first time in history to give all the people an opportunity to be persons. In Christian phrase we would call this saving souls. For how do souls get lost? By becoming tethered in little circles of habit which go around and round and come out nowhere, which means always getting back to the same place, which means remaining in the same place, which means death.

It is the devil's purpose, if you believe in the devil, or it is the purpose of the enemy of life, if you believe in the enemy of life (and you must if you have your eyes open, because he is everywhere) to lure men into these circles or prison-habits and keep them there chasing, driving, so they think, but really *chased, driven*.

The greatest assistant the devil ever had in his work is commercialism, that way of life which looks upon things as objects of exchange, ignoring their intrinsic value, thinking of them only in terms of the money they are "worth" and in what manner they may be made to "pay." A picture of the debasement of man by commercialism may be seen in the newsreel of the purse-like face of Schacht, the string drawn tight at his mouth, looking at the Nuremberg trial film showing bins of gold dentures torn from murdered human beings, switching suddenly to show tubs full of severed heads, warehouses full of human hair for mattress manufacturers, flesh for soap manufacturers. The eyes of Schacht did not blink. The habit of calculation seemed to hold him in its talons.

To repeat, the theory of Christianity and Judaism of the infinite value of each human being is denied in our commercial society. As an ideal it may be "striven for," never by means less perfect than the ideal. This of course prevents all striving, for the premise of striving is the use of less than perfect means; this for the simple reason that the means must be taken by less than perfect people in a world less than perfect.

Thus our pulpit-striving takes for granted that the end to be reached has already been reached, and so the pulpits of our commercial culture are cut off entirely from those people who want to join theory and practice in one integral life, cut off, that is, from truly religious people.

It is our opinion that the Soviet Union which has no use for theory apart from practice is bringing man's divided soul together again, binding up the terrible wound with which our commercial society has divided the soul of Western man.

Critics of the Soviet Union frequently say that Soviet individuals are lost in the existence of the state. But what is an individual? Is he not an undivided person? And is it not here in Western capitalistic society that man has been divided not only from himself but from his world? And is it not the Soviet government that is trying to give man the opportunity to find himself once more and to find his world?

The schizophrenia, or the divided soul, or the lost soul, as we Christians put it, of our commercial society, is sometimes regularized and made acceptable by heavy thinkers who clothe it in a tragic cloak and bear it as a cross. They make of society a fixed evil thing which cannot be changed and of man an impotent victim of this society. Since he is not responsible for it he cannot be expected to remedy it and

so in one way or another, whether by deep thinkers or shallow thinkers, the general climate of hypocrisy makes our diplomatic and political hypocrisy all the more acceptable to people generally.

But fascism is not of itself by nature pietistic and as it takes power it becomes independent of the church and gradually drops its earlier pretence to piety. Then we get the much-routed "quarrels" between the church and the fascist state with the double hypocrisy in the complaints of the church against state interference with church concessions. This happened in Europe in the days of Hitler and it is being repeated now. Even during the development today in Western Germany of the new America-sponsored fascism we can hear the complaints of Pastor Niemoller who says German "people are being convinced now that the whole propaganda for democracy has been an illusion, worse even than Hitler's propaganda. For everybody knew or soon came to know, that Hitler personally did not admit any authority superior to himself; but the Western powers propagated humane and Christian principles and asserted that they were fighting for the validity of these principles. This faith has been utterly shattered, and what is even worse, with this faith the trust in any truth and humanity has been destroyed."

Of course the propaganda for democracy was an illusion! If Pastor Niemoller had learned anything since he was a U-Boat Commander he would know *why* it was an illusion. All talk of democracy becomes illusory in a commercial society where corporate greed calls every tune. Corporate greed (it happens to be American this time) is calling the tune in Germany. Corporate greed is not human. It has no face. But the Germans would reproach corporate greed for betraying their trust in It. They prefer to curse God and die than to curse greed and live. To such depths the church is led in a commercial society.

Niemoller makes the point that Germany is as badly off as any other part of Europe. But he fails to measure the struggles of *some of the people of Europe against corporate greed*. And in so failing he declares once more the bankruptcy of that institutional religion which has been conditioned in a commercial society.

We believe that Soviet Russia has opened a new era in the religious life of mankind.

Its philosophers may emphasize alternately their one-ness with and their other-ness from past philosophies. They may, as philosophers have always done, stress alternately determinism and freedom in man. Philosophers, important as they are, always move behind life, steadying it on its way perhaps but never wholly anticipating it and frequently out of step with it entirely. The mystic, the religious man *par excellence*, does not despise philosophy but he is ready at a moment's notice to break its back if it gets in the way of life.

From scientific research, from applied science, from agriculture, from mining, from fishing, from industry, the Soviet Union has taken the cold technicality and into each has breathed the warmth of vital relationships, so that a man enters a laboratory, or a fishing boat, or a mine, or a factory, with an absolutely new conception of his role. He and his fellows are parts of a great throbbing life. Their little selves are gone. Surely we can recognize in this life analogies with what we have dreamed of as true religion. Granted that our picture is not exact, that there are malcontents. Granted that there are areas of human instinct apart from the commercial instinct which are liable to be led into temptation. Such things should not be ignored, but the present is a time for rejoicing. The human spirit has, in the Soviet Marxist experiment, heroically shaken itself free from mankind's greatest chain.

Some will say we shouldn't call this religion because it was achieved by people who hate the forms of religion and who did what they did in the name of humanism. Such an objection will naturally come from those who are dominated by formalistic religion and by those who believe that religious insights are revealed to man from the *outside*. To the mystic the atheism of the Russians will be quite understandable. Wherever truly human hearts beat they will rejoice in the fulfillment of the promise of the good news about man.

Man climbed laboriously from the days of the tribe through the feudal and capitalistic eras, up the steep inclines from his ignorance of the secrets of nature, up through the narrow defiles of his own greed. At last he has come through the high pass of the mountains of his sojourning. He has not come to the end, no, but, standing where he does stand, he has the right, nay the duty, to rejoice and to give thanks and to sing great hymns to the Spirit of his Ongoing.

CHURCH INVADES STATE SCHOOLS

A public school man who, because of the strong anti-democratic feeling running at present in this country, is compelled to write under an assumed name, describes in the present issue of this magazine the New Jersey bus fare decision as ominous for the future of the public school. In the course of his article he quotes Justice Rutledge as stating that the first breach in the wall separating church and state was made some years ago when the Louisiana legislature appropriated money for "school books," to be distributed free to "the school children of the state." When objections were raised because the parochial schools shared in this benefit the case was carried to the Supreme Court which upheld without dissent the action of the state legislature. The grounds for that decision which served as a precedent for the New Jersey bus decision were that a "public purpose" was served. So today it is argued that transport to schools is a matter of public welfare quite apart from the character of the schools themselves.

The writer of the article happens to be concentrating upon the public school issue. It is true that the principle of the separation of church and state is the safeguard of our public school. The first breach in the principle was made, however, long before the Louisiana case mentioned by Justice Rutledge.

It should be remembered that this great principle was revolutionary in its time and was never thoroughly worked out in practice. Moreover it is unlikely that it ever will be or indeed can be worked out in such a way that the church will be entirely independent of the state. In the final analysis there can be only one master in a house. Democracy means that the people, through laws made by the majority have the final say concerning all the institutions, which operate within the framework of this law. This control of institutional life, which includes the school and the church, is never obvious until the institutional life comes into competition or conflict with the larger democratic life.

This happened, for instance, with the Mormon church, when it was compelled to yield on the question of polygamy. The same conflict arises with pacifist sects in war time. It should be remembered that if the Mormons had been a very large church, national in scope, of great financial and political power, our democratic state might have been compelled to yield in which case polygamy would have been the rule among large sections of our population and might even at some future date have characterized our whole culture. In the same way pacifist sects, if strong and powerful enough, might reduce the state to such impotence that the Nicaraguan army could march into Washington and take over the government.

These are extreme, and you may say, ridiculous examples. Today, however, we are confronted with a sect, the Roman Catholic Church, which makes absolute claims upon the right to teach. These claims are made without reference to laws or the will of any people. They are founded in the fanatic belief that God has put that particular sect over and above all people to teach them. This too sounds ridiculous, almost as much so as the other examples cited. But it is true. It is literal fact. It is such a monstrous fact, such a powerful threat to the whole basis of our democratic life, that we are unwilling to face it.

Why, we may ask, are the Protestant churches unwilling to meet this issue straightforwardly and fight it now to a finish while we have the power to win? Here is where we must look outside the field of education to find the answer, although even

within the field of education itself there is no unanimity in Protestant support of public schools. Some Protestant sects prefer to establish and maintain their own systems of elementary, secondary and advanced education than to put in with state schools and colleges. Some of this has been due to ecclesiastical reasons, some of it can be put down to snob or "social" reasons. The establishment of Protestant private schools has cost our public schools much. A school needs more than cold taxpayers' money. It needs the warmth, interest, love of its students throughout their lives. As we have pointed out before in these columns, the American public school is rapidly becoming a step-child of our society.

Protestants do not merely give the cold shoulder to our public schools. They criticize it adversely. Bishop Noll in his scathing attack upon our public schools entitled "Public Enemy No. 1" is able to support his case by large quotations from Protestant sources.

Exemption from taxation, which at present applies to all churches may soon be made to apply to a smaller area of churches nominated for that privilege by a cartel of churches which enjoy the blessing of the business cartels. This exemption has always been a direct conditioning link between church and state. It is a definite breach in the principle of separation of church and state.

The chaplaincy is another institution which links the church and state through the armed forces, bringing the spiritual life of the soldier directly under the control of the army and navy through state pay to chaplains.

Through these two institutions and through the habit of associating ecclesiastical services and liturgies with various state occasions like the opening and closing of legislative sessions, courts, official celebrations, there has been built up something that is more than a bowing acquaintance between the church and the state. This relationship has been seized upon by those who wish to extend it further, to build it back into the constitution as a principle which will blanket and smother to death the principle of separation of church and state.

Official Protestantism will soon kiss, if it has not already kissed, the principle of separation of church and state good-bye. The Baptists and a few others are the only ones left to bother about it anyway. We fear they will not have sufficient power to swing Protestantism their way. Even many Baptists have lost touch with their tradition in this respect. President Truman is a Baptist and he has just reached out a friendly hand to the Pope whose church considers the doctrine of the separation of church and state to be a heresy.

This whole question comes into sharpest focus on the domestic scene in the public school but its ramifications are as wide as life itself.

THE CHURCH AND THE AMERICAN CENTURY

It is becoming more difficult all the time for Americans who desire world peace to strive for it with any consistency. The ground is being taken from under their feet by the actions of their government. These actions speak louder than any words and they say that the world is an American world. When we send arms into Greece it is a purely defensive operation because Greece is a part of America; and when we send arms to Chiang Kai-shek it is because, as Dr. Van Dusen would put it, America's frontier is between China and Russia. China is part of America. Indonesia too is part of America. We will settle the little difference between this colonial people and our Dutch superintendents. England has been frozen out of India and is being frozen out of the Near East and these areas are already falling into Uncle Sam's pockets.

We shall operate through the old empires, French, Dutch, Belgian, and British for a little while until our boys have been indoctrinated in the usages of empire and until we have developed an imperial technique and tradition of our own. Later on they may be incorporated in a Great America as Territories or Reservations. Wherever this world runs up against the frontiers of that other world behind the iron

curtain of their mutual antipathy—there is the boundary of the new American World over which Henry Luce chortles and over which "Mottsy" DuPont rubs his hands in gleeful anticipation of unimaginable profits. This is the world over which Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr will pull down the corners of his mouth in tragic acceptance of the lesser of two evils in an immoral world, and which will be proclaimed in more happy terms by other followers of the humble Nazarene who teach his precepts in the theological seminary presided over by Rockefeller's banker, Mr. Aldrich. Yes, there will be no dearth of ecclesiastical sanction for the burgeoning of the Pax Americana.

What will happen to those who insist on total peace? Within what framework will they carry on their struggle? What in particular will happen to those ministers who refuse the leadership of the Federal Council and its John Foster Dulles?

We fear that they will be pushed down and out of the preferred places in the church. Many of them will lose their churches and be unable to find new ones. Wherever they go however, they will take with them the principles and the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth. Some will be forced into small country churches and into workers' churches in the cities. They will be compelled to build new churches.

Out of the travail they will gain new character and new strength. Who knows, perhaps they will create on earth a new body, a new institution to house the spirit they have brought with them. We have faith that this will happen because the issues dividing the world today are fundamental issues. They go too deep to be disposed of by negotiation or compromise. The issue is Mammon versus man. Since the organized church today has bowed the knee to the God of Dollars there will arise as surely as tomorrow's sun a new church which will bow the knee to the God of Man.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS FOR SALE

In the last issue we examined the statement of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America entitled "Crossroads of American Foreign Policy" and found that it was in effect a preachment preparing the minds and hearts of all Protestants for a third world war.

Now we have to report that the International Council of Religious Education has in its 1947 annual convention made a similar appeal to the youth in our Protestant Sunday Schools. The Attorney-General of the United States, Tom Clark, spoke before the convention of the International Council on whose board sits a representative of E. I. DuPont de Nemours.

Mr. Clark said that Communism is "spreading with the speed of a prairie fire, that the time has passed when we can dismiss the spread of atheistic Communism as a phenomenon of the lunatic fringe." "No longer," said he, "do we visualize the destroyers of democracy and Christianity as a bomb carrying, bewiskered madman in heavy boots . . . today he is streamlined in all kinds of guises, sometimes behind a democratic front."

The Attorney-General went on to warn against the evils of the police state, an unconscious irony considering that he himself is in a sense at the head of the "police state" at present taking form in the United States. By identifying the word "democracy" and the word "Christianity" he aids and abets the anti-Semitic and anti-humanist activities of those who push their fascist wares under the banner of Christ. As the editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature* puts it, "The present witch hunt is blind, unreasoning, and dangerous. Anyone who has ever allowed his gaze to rest upon a single liberal idea will be hunted down with the rest. Besides, he happens to be the real target."

The International Council of Religious Education which sponsored Tom Clark's speech attacking religious liberty, is itself an association which acts effectively to restrain the liberty of the religious press. It is a kind of cartel or trade association of the Protestant publishers of Sunday School literature and its chief function is to promote the interests of the denominational press. A speech like Tom Clark's is a

great boost for the denominational press. It won't work, however, because the children themselves will demand literature with new ideas and fresh interpretations of life.

For years this Council has solicited funds from businessmen who saw the value of Sunday School propaganda in heading off socialistic ideas at the impressionable age of the child's development. Russell Colgate of Colgate's toothpaste was a contributor. One of the vice-presidents of the Council is Alfred H. Avery, manager of the New England branch of DuPont. Mr. Avery is a personal friend of Bishops Louis O. Hartman and Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist church. We respectfully suggest that these bishops go with their friend Avery to Lamont DuPont and appeal to that descendant of the Huguenots to repent and to return to the principles of his forefathers.

By listening to Tom Clark and then endorsing his red-baiting campaign in its resolutions the International Council of Religious Education forfeits its right to give moral or spiritual education to the children of America. For these resolutions are directed against those Christians in every communion who apply the principles of Jesus to economic and social relationships. Under this leadership our children are taught the tenets of economic fundamentalism: *the Corporation is God*, with its correlative moral principle: *money is always right*.

THE PROTESTANT calls for a new organization of Sunday School teachers in Protestant churches throughout the country which shall be independent of the Rockefellerers and the DuPonts, independent also of John Foster Dulles.

CAMOUFLAGING FASCISM

After much delay a report on "Fascism in Action" has been published by the Government Printing Office in Washington. Objections had been made to its publication by representatives in Congress, one of whom, Fred E. Busbey, Republican from Illinois, criticized its condemnation of Franco Spain.

The report quotes Representative Busbey's comparison of Fascism with Communism to the disadvantage of the latter: "While Communism is frankly atheistic and intolerant of religion as an 'opiate for the people,' Fascism does not in principle set itself against religion, as religion, but, rather, attacks specific religious groups and practices because they stand in the way of the full achievement of the Fascist program. Communism frowns on private property, and nationalizes industries, banks, agricultural land, and all forms of property which may represent wealth. In contrast, Fascism, on advent to power, reprivatizes previously nationalized business, encourages cartels, and develops large private property holdings . . . as far as world politics is concerned, there is no Fascist equivalent for the Communist program of world revolution . . ."

Busbey was successful in having the section dealing with Spain and the Roman Church shortened and re-written so as to justify the church's position. The report says: "Spanish Catholicism emerged from the civil war restored to its traditional position of political influence and subsidized to the extent of some \$5,400,000 annually . . . In spite of the reviving strength of Spanish Catholic Church, it would appear that there still was in April, 1947, an ideological incompatibility between the church and the Fascist wing of the Falange similar to that which once existed in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy."

In spite of the efforts of the authors of this pamphlet to smear Communism by comparing it unfavorably with Fascism, a strong clue to the truth leaks out in the effort to whitewash Fascism by indicating its service to the church particularly in the the final passage quoted here which betrays the stark ugly truth of the close working relationship between Fascism and political ecclesiasticism. This was of course Roman Catholic in Roman Catholic sections and Protestant in Protestant sections.

It is hard to exaggerate the monstrous evil of comparing Communism with Fascism as two types of totalitarianism. Without Communist resistance to Fascism

throughout the world there is little doubt that we would all be today under the heel of Nazi-Fascism. The world was well aware of this during the long two years when Russia was absorbing the blows of the Nazis at a terrible cost in blood and treasure. The Western world is very stupid now to forget all that and to initiate within itself a new anti-Comintern which will deliver it straight into the arms of a revitalized clerical-inspired Fascism.

RED-PROTESTANT SMEARING

Some weeks ago *Newsweek* said in its columns that THE PROTESTANT had advocated war on the Nazis only after they had attacked Russia. We wrote to *Newsweek* a correction which they could easily have verified by reference to our own editorial columns previous to June, 1941, and to the news section of the *New York Times* which carried on April 28 of that year, our demand for outright war on the Nazis. Actually we were one of the first, if not the first, periodicals in America to call for war, not only previous to Pearl Harbor but previous to June 22 when Hitler attacked Russia.

Newsweek did not print our letter. We wrote them again asking them to print the correction since it involved our editorial integrity. They refused. Obviously they wish the public to think we are not an independent periodical but a front for somebody else. So they let their lie stand.

This is an example of the positive red smear. There is a negative red smearing which is carried on continuously by "liberal" individuals and newspapers. One of our most liberal newspapers once sent a photographer to our office to take a picture of a group of our ministers who had been carrying on some particular piece of anti-fascist work. The story appeared in the newspaper, which we shall not name, without reference to the organization under whose auspices these ministers had done their work. On two other occasions exactly the same thing was done by the same newspaper. It gave publicity, with pictures, to successful undertakings of THE PROTESTANT *without mentioning the name of THE PROTESTANT.*

Today if you happen to be in New York, in the lobby of the Globe Theatre where the Roosevelt Story is running, you will find a number of well-known artists' drawings illustrating FDR's fireside chats. These pictures were made under the auspices of THE PROTESTANT and the ACA Galleries in New York. Those who arranged this exhibit, however, refused to mention the sponsorship of THE PROTESTANT, announcing simply that they were being shown with the courtesy of the ACA Galleries.

These things may seem petty to the reader, but it must be remembered that an organization progresses in its work only if it is identified with the things it does. Therefore the negative red smearing and Protestant smearing on the part of liberals and progressives is as harmful, if not more so, than the positive red smearing of such house organs of Big Money as *Newsweek*.

OUR CABLE TO PALESTINE

The following interchange with Sir Alan Cunningham needs little explanation. Cunningham may not like it but his job is to carry out policy as laid down at the Foreign Office.

Lt. Gen. Sir Alan Cunningham
High Commissioner of Palestine
Jerusalem, Palestine

Representing over 5,000 American Christian clergymen dedicated to the task of removing the age old cancer of anti-Semitism from the body of Christen-

dom, in repentance and shame for 2,000 years of Christian mistreatment of the Jew, in special consideration of the fact that the Palestine problem is now being reviewed by the UN, and that your example of forbearance and clemency will have the effect of adding light now lacking in an obscure and passion-complicated situation, we appeal to you to exercise the royal prerogative of pardon delegated to you by His Majesty in the case of the three terrorists, Meir Nakak, Yacoub Weiss, Avshalom Habib, now under sentence of death.

KENNETH LESLIE

British Embassy
Washington 8, D. C.
9th August 1947

Dear Sir,

We have been asked by the High Commissioner for Palestine to say that he received your cable dated 9th July about the three terrorists.

He asks us to tell you that your petition was given the most careful consideration, but that he regrets that he was unable to intervene.

Yours faithfully,

T. E. BROMLEY
First Secretary

Talk of justice by the British in Palestine or by their American backers cannot be taken seriously. The world knows that the concern of the British-Americans is not with people at all but with oil and the strategic use of land in the changing pattern of imperialism.

The British have exacerbated the Jews to the use of force or terror.

The terror which has been visited upon the Jews during the Christian era culminated in the systematic murder of six million of their men, women and children by the German exponents of Christian culture whom we now rush to re-arm for fresh murders.

It is sad that the gallant knight Alan Cunningham found himself "unable to intervene" in the killing of the three Jewish patriots. We believe him. This blood was demanded by the Foreign Office as a new measure of exacerbation.

The Fact No One Will Face

The plan is obvious enough. Except for one fact (not the Arabs) Britain-America could have brought a Jewish Palestine into their Near East deals as a partner without harming themselves in the least. What stops them? The Vatican. The Vatican simply cannot go along with a Jewish Holy Land. The Vatican's life-premise is that the Holy Land is Christ's and to what earthly power should "Christ's Homeland" belong? Clearly to His Vicar, gloriously reigning.

Until both Jews and non-Jewish friends of Palestine realize this simple fundamental fact there will be little progress made in establishing a firm world political foundation for Eretz Israel.

ADDED NOTES

Late in August an appeal was signed by 86 labor members of the British Parliament and sent to King Paul of Greece. The message read: "We labor members of the British House of Commons beg you to believe that a profound sense of horror is spreading through the British people at what is happening in Greece today. We appeal to you in the name of humanity to exercise your prerogative and to save the lives of the 1,300 former resistance fighters now under suspended sentence of death: to stop the execu-

tion of men and women sentenced to death by the courts martial for alleged political offenses, and to use your influence to secure the relief of the thousands of deportees suffering such anguish on the islands of exile."

As this appeal went forward from London to Athens, the United States government was sending its own peculiar message across the Atlantic. Twelve army transports were rushing \$18,000,000 worth of "urgent military supplies" to that coalition of Greek quislings and megalomaniacs which the State Department has adopted, for better or worse, as protégés. From Washington came the ancient story: the United States was interested only in giving Greece sufficient aid to withstand disaster, and that the United States was in no way interfering in Greek internal affairs.

* * *

Sure indications of a police state are the political prisons. In Hungary, which has been called a police state by American commentators and officials, Howard Smith, chief of CBS European News Staff reporting on Hungary which he visited a week or so ago says that he was told that tens of thousands of persons were languishing in the Budapest political prison. He went to the prison and found exactly 19 prisoners who looked healthy and well and who had no marks of mistreatment. Smith said, "There was no indication Hungary would be influenced in any way save by liberal persuasion. Most important of all, there is not the slightest indication that I could see that there will be any Russian interference" in the coming elections. Smith said that Russia's influence was strong but it was unmaterial and psychological.

* * *

James S. Martin, former chief of the de-cartellization branch of the military government in Germany says that proposals giving Germany priority in European construction are a successful culmination of German propaganda drives which were "already laid out before V-E Day, and which have been clicking along with discouraging regularity ever since. If we allow the Germans to make suckers out of us for a third time without even changing their line or making up a new method of deception, we shall deserve the troubles we bring upon ourselves—but our children will not."

* * *

Occupation of Germany by the U.S.A. for at least 20 years, largely on a civilian basis is recommended by Dr. Everett Clinchy, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews who has just returned from the conference of the International Council for Christians and Jews in Switzerland. Thus the NCCJ once more comes to bat for the cartels. The words have been put into Everett's mouth by those who envisage a close alliance between German and American industrial cartels in the interests of reaction.

* * *

The Union for Democratic Action has a *London Letter* which presents what it calls an American view of present day England. Speaking of the Ruhr, the July 26, 1947, issue criticizes the American "proposal to postpone socialization for five years (in terms of world politics, forever)." This "may seem good business and the last word in efficiency. But it could mean millions of votes to French and German Communists, and the Marshall baby may be let out with the bath."

It would seem that the Marshall baby is full twin to the UDA baby. The mother of this set of twins is a deep seated hatred of Communism and their father is the lust for war.

RIO BARGAIN BASEMENT

By O. I. ROCHE

JUST when the heat wave was at its height in the U.S.A., delegates from 18 little American countries and one big one tripped fantastically down to Rio, stamping grounds of the Carioca.

By Labor Day they had all had their say; and in the invigorating presence of President Harry S. Truman they signed and almost sealed an improved copy of a treaty which had been circulated among them some months before.

This treaty, euphemistically but not so euphonistically known as the "Hemispheric Mutual Defense Pact," says a lot of things, besides binding Bolivia and Honduras to defend the North and South Poles. But its pith, so to speak, is in Article 3 (1).

"The high contracting parties agree," Article 3 (1) affirms, "that an armed attack by any state or states against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all American states and consequently each one of said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack. . . ."

The interesting point in that paragraph is not the typical pseudo-English used in such documents, but the studied avoidance of the word "aggression."

"Attack" is a fine word, but it is not synonymous with "aggression." *An attack can be made on an aggressor.* The letter of this treaty, if not its spirit—and who can interpret the spirit of a treaty—could lead to some rather startling complications.

Let us whimsically suppose that Bolivia, trying out a U.S. surplus bomber of the type we intend to palm off on Latin America pretty soon, were to fly it over Switzerland and drop a bomb on a bierstube. The indignant Swiss, making use of some similar surplus they picked up last year, might fly another bomber right back, and, with Swiss precision, exemplified in their watches, blast a Bolivian tin mine right into Lake Titicaca.

That would certainly be a dastardly deed on the part of Switzerland and it would certainly be an attack. It would not, however, be an aggression, since Bolivia hit the bierstube first.

What would happen then, according to the "Hemispheric Mutual Defense Pact," Article 3 (1)?

Well, sir, every American state, from Argentina through Alaska, would be obliged to "undertake to assist in meeting the attack" of Switzerland. Chileans and Hondurans, Mexicans and Patagonians, Ojibways and Jibaros, Cubans and Nova Scotians, would mobilize to defend the American continent from the embattled Swiss.

That's how all-inclusive the "Hemispheric Mutual Defense Pact" is.

What earthly motive could lead 19 countries, as various in their opinions as the nations of North and South America are, to get together in Brazil and sign such a pact?

In international politics, as a rule there are two kinds of motives. One is economic. The other while also basically economic, is political in appearance.

For example, if Britain wants a loan from the United States, its actions toward us are determined by its desire for a loan. Its motive is economic.

But if Britain maintains troops in Palestine, it does so for political reasons—reasons of strategic policy; although these, too, of course, are ultimately economic.

At the Inter-American Conference in Petropolis, Brazil, the motives of the attending countries were likewise political and economic.

The motive of the United States was especially political; the motives of the Latin American countries were overwhelmingly economic.

What was the political motive of the United States? What was the purpose of the military alliance our State Department conceived and helped dedicate at Petropolis?

The answer is simple:

The State Department was motivated by its desire to strengthen its hand in its current squeeze play against the Soviet Union in Europe and Asia.

"Look," Mr. Marshall can now say to Mr. Molotov, "all of Latin America, all of America from pole to pole is behind

the United States. You had better be good!"

This interpretation of the State Department's motive at Rio is not an isolated one. It is, for example, the official interpretation of the Vatican.

Camille Cianfarra, reasonably honest correspondent in Rome for the *New York Times*, wrote on August 23, while the Rio Conference was underway:

"*L'Osservatore Romano* today expressed what Vatican circles said was Pope Pius' full support of Washington's Latin American policy for the maintenance of continental peace and security.

"In a two-column editorial, the Vatican newspaper praised Secretary of State George C. Marshall's Rio de Janeiro speech as laying down a policy that paves the way to peace and implicitly condemned Russian totalitarianism as containing within itself the seeds of war."

Quite plainly, *L'Osservatore Romano*, official reflection of the Vatican, sees Marshall's policy as expressed in the Rio treaty to be paving the way to peace by preparing for war against Russia.

The chances are *L'Osservatore's* opinion is slightly colored by its wishes, for the aim of the State Department is probably more to groom Latin America for use in its diplomatic poker game rather than for armed warfare.

In the treaty it arranged at Petropolis, the State Department filled in one more card toward the royal flush it hopes to draw in its little game with Moscow. The real value of that card is one thing; its value as a bluff might be something else. It's hard to say how Russians might react to these poker tactics.

It's even harder to say how feudal Latin America might react if the bluff were called.

There were 19 countries which signed the "Hemispheric Mutual Defense Pact." Only one of them was the United States. What induced 18 Latin American nations to sign a treaty that, in effect, made them militarily dependent on the United States?

Not long ago a highly placed Latin American, in position to know intimately the exact sentiments of the president of his country, told the writer the following:

"The president recognizes the proposed alliance for what it is, but he will go along with it. He thinks it is a prerequisite to getting economic cooperation from the United States. Unless we sign up, he thinks, we would be economically strangled."

That explanation, beyond any doubt whatsoever, was the determining factor behind the action of every Latin American delegate participating in the Inter-American Conference at Petropolis, Brazil.

Even while the Conference was going on, Brazil was sandwiching in negotiations for a loan—a loan which will almost certainly be announced within a few weeks.

Just before the Conference began, high-ranking United States businessmen literally flocked to Buenos Aires for talks with Juan Domingo Peron and Argentine cabinet ministers. Most of them were housed and wined at the Argentine government's expense.

Even in the middle of the Conference, the Mexican delegation backed down from its intended support of Cuban delegate Dr. Guillermo Belt, who insisted, for a while, that economic aggression be cited in the treaty. They had received a directive, a warning that such a stand might cause "a cool reception" in Washington.

These few samples could be illustrated in the case of almost every Latin American country present at the Conference.

Latin America was whipped into line and bound up in the "Hemispheric Mutual Defense Pact" by its fear of economic retaliation from the United States.

Latin America, even including Argentina, which for a time was almost able to stand alone as a result of the huge influx of Axis resources, is today economically dependent on the United States to a greater degree than ever in history.

When the United States cracks the economic whip, Latin America jumps.

That is the secret behind the "unanimity" registered at the Petropolis Conference.

That is the meaning of the "Hemispheric Mutual Defense Pact."

It is a poor card to hold.

THE RUHR ROAD TO WAR

By WILLIAM BRANDT

—A flashback of things to come.

A FULL page ad in the Metropolitan newspaper reproducing an editorial of the McGraw Hill publications, headlined "The Ruhr—Valley of Decision," reveals intentions and purposes in high places of such sinister nature that it should not go unchallenged.

"Upon recovery in the Ruhr hinges recovery in Europe. Upon recovery in Europe hinges the peace of the world," says Mr. McGraw, just returned from a visit to Germany.

In the following we propose to dissect the sophistry contained in these seemingly so common-sense propositions.

Mr. McGraw proceeds to recommend a simple solution: Only American Big Business has the money and the know-how, so let's go in and take over from the bungling British. The setup is ideally suited for such a move; the corporate structure of German industry in general and of German heavy industry in particular lends itself admirably to American industrial overlordship. The big German concerns have their Vorstand (Board of Directors) and Aufsichtsrat (Supervisory Board). This is traditional. The Nazi regime, by the law promulgated in 1937, just tightened up this selfsame corporate structure in accordance with the Fuehrer principle depriving the stockholders of their last vestiges of rights and investing the Aufsichtsrat with almost absolute authority.

What, then, could be simpler and smoother than for the Americans to occupy the Aufsichtsrat and let the German experts operate in the Vorstand? A perfect hierarchy.

"The top supervising managing jobs," says Mr. McGraw—"both the top policy and the top technical jobs—require outstanding business ability. That is why American businessmen must be willing to go to Germany. . . . Germans should take over the management jobs at the operating level. The Germans are good technicians. They have a greater incentive than anyone else for getting the

Ruhr back in working order. That incentive should be harnessed."

This may seem an exceedingly shrewd move in a tough-minded business strategy. But for present and future generations of Americans it spells murder. The very smoothness of the operation as envisaged bears out strikingly and frighteningly Veblen's prophetic warning in "Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution" about the Americanization of German and Prussianization of American Big Business. For the success of the move the American people would have to be reeducated in the spirit of Nazism. It would consummate the present tendencies in America of a close liaison between the military and Big Business. It would send America staggering down the road toward fascism and war.

Arming The Enemy

The monstrous evil contained in these suggestions can best be glimpsed in the light of a historical flashback.

The Weimar Republic gave rise to Hitler because after the defeat suffered in the first World War the economic and political power of the Ruhr magnates was not being uprooted. Restoring the power of the Thyssen, Krupp, Flick etc., meant, however, inevitably restoring the power of Prussian militarism. Why?

The answer is simple. The gigantic Ruhr combine carried from the outset such a large measure of excess capacity and such a high degree of corresponding overcapitalization that military orders were necessarily the very basis of its existence.

To secure France's reparations claims after the first world war, Poincaré marched the French Army into the Ruhr in 1923. And what happened? The occupation of the Ruhr turned out to be a grievous fiasco—and worse.

Poincaré did not think of uprooting the economic and political power of the Ruhr magnates. The jealousy of the Anglo-American Allies, not to speak of the

Comité Des Forges, dead set against creating such an unsavory precedent in a world of "bolshevik experiments," saw to that.

The upshot was the phony Ruhr resistance with the Ruhr magnates riding the waves. It was in this strange interlude that the ground-work was laid for German rearmament and finally Hitler. The notorious Seeckt-Severing pact, dated February 7, 1923, decided upon the organization of the Black Reichswehr. It was prepared in a talk between Hugo Stinnes and Ludendorff and was signed by President Ebert, Chancellor Cuno and the Prussian Minister of the Interior, Severing. Ostensibly, the secret pact was an attempt to resist the invasion of the Ruhr; in reality it consummated the baleful postwar marriage between army and big business.

Poincaré's adventure foundered on the silent partnership between the Ruhr magnates and Anglo-American capital.

After the failure of the Ruhr occupation Anglo-American capital was pumped into this heart of German heavy industry. This was euphemistically called "European Reconstruction."

The rehabilitated battlehorse was champing at the bit. For the reasons mentioned above (excess capacity, overcapitalization) *Ruhr monopoly and peace are totally incompatible.*

But the years of the uneasy peace dragged on. The tempo of secret German rearmament before Hitler was relatively much too slow for the profit requirements of the Ruhr monopolies. So the Ruhr magnates went broke. And there is hardly anything more brutally aggressive than a bankrupt monopoly.

The receivership was arranged neatly. This was the last act of the Weimar Republic before yielding to Hitler: in 1932 the Government rescued the United Steel Trust (Vereinigte Stahlwerke) by the purchase of stock in the amount of 125 million marks in the Gelsenkirchen mining concern. After the bank crash of 1931 the control of most of the big banks was taken over by the state.

The captains of industry and finance acquiesced in being thus saved by the despised weak democracy but heartily disliked these "halfway measures."

The promise of "reprivatization" was

Hitler's trump card. (Thus Mr. McGraw so staunchly opposing socialization schemes for the Ruhr, has worthy predecessors.) In power, the Nazis made good on their promise. They repealed by a decree of December 13, 1935 the law of 1919 permitting the municipalization of power production. They sold back the control of Gelsenkirchen for 100 million marks and allowed Thyssen to manipulate a lucrative capital reorganization with a new holding company. As early as 1933 the Deutsche Bank got 20 million marks of its stock back from the Government and became fully private by March 1937. The same with the other big banks such as the Commerz-und Privatbank and the Dresdener Bank whose shares likewise were no longer held by the Government.

Meanwhile, German rearmament forged full speed ahead. From the Dawes and Young Plan to the Hoover moratorium: this is the story of American capital rehabilitating the Ruhr and financing German rearmament.

These are the lessons of how the peace was lost after the first world war.

The situation after the second world war has quite a few new elements such as the popular forces unleashed by the resistance against Hitlerism and by the war of national liberation. American foreign policy as well as the world strategy of American Big Business is increasingly based on a fanatic determination to look away from or exclude from calculations these new elements in the picture.

For today the lure of a shortcut presents itself: moving in and taking over. If the British are in the way tell them where they get off. "He who pays the piper shall call the tune," as Mr. McGraw puts it. If the French object for reasons of their national security let's disregard them. "If we succeed, the Western zones of Germany in conjunction with Belgium and Holland can become self-supporting in three to five years," says Mr. McGraw. Note the lordly gesture with which France is dismissed.

This way lies disaster and the shattering of the American dream. The democratic solution would be American assistance for a genuine reconstruction of Europe with a denazified Germany integrated into the European economy. There is only one practical way of teaching the Germans

that aggression does not pay and that is the speeding up of economic reconstruction in the liberated countries.

But for that the American monopolies themselves would have to be taught that aggression does not pay. Giving priority

to the rebuilding of the Ruhr as an American heavy industrial base in Europe is a move that is bound to convey the idea to the Americans in the Aufsichtsrat and the Germans in the Vorstand that aggression does pay.

PROTESTANTS MURDERED

MEXICO PROTECTS VICTIMS OF CATHOLIC FANATICISM

—From the Mexico City Newspaper, "El Popular," August 1, 1947

On request of the Federal Attorney General's office, the Secretary of National Defense will send strong detachments to the towns of San Francisco, Zacalco and Huipoxtlá, in the State of Mexico to enforce order and give full protection to non-Catholics.

The non-Catholics are suffering daily attacks at the hands of fanatics in those areas, who will not let them live in peace and persecute them ferociously. There have already been some cases of individuals of the Protestant faith being barbarously slain because of their beliefs.

Bishop Ruesga Martinez recently requested the Attorney General's office for Federal intervention to stop abuses and crimes committed by Catholics in Huipoxtlá and San Francisco Zacalco against those professing the Protestant faith.

In his statement, Bishop Ruesga Martinez says that the priest in that area uses his pulpit to arouse Catholics against Protestants, inciting them to a holy war; and that because of cultural conditions among the inhabitants, who are mostly aborigines, the exhortation has produced tremendous effects.

Protestants have been obliged to abandon their farms and their houses and in many cases their families, while on many occasions Protestants, including Juan Cruz, Antonio Pacheco and Nicolas Carvajal, have been stoned and assaulted in their homes.

Two Protestants Were Savagely Killed

Continuing his account of what has happened in this wide area of the State of Mexico, Bishop Ruesga Martinez says that Protestants Feliciano Juarez and Jose Garita were recently slain in a completely savage way by a gang of fanatics which had been incited by the priest of the region.

The crimes remained without punishment because the regional authorities have become accomplices of the priest and have not carried out the slightest investigation to clarify the crimes and fix responsibilities.

State's Attorney Will Make Investigation

In the Federal Attorney General's office it was said that the facts exposed were common crimes and that the papers containing the charges and other related documents will be sent to the Attorney General's office in the State of Mexico. It is this office which should investigate the case and arrest the culprits.

RED CHINA AND CATHOLIC MISSIONS

By ANNA LOUISE STRONG

A CONCERTED effort is being made by the Roman Catholics to attack the democratic regimes of North China by stories of alleged atrocities perpetrated by Chinese Communists against Roman Catholic missions. I have watched the stories grow for about a year.

The various local governments of North China — Communist-led — declare that they protect freedom of religion. People of all religions — Christian, Moslem, Buddhist, Confucian — sit in the elected governments. Mission churches and hospitals function in some places; in others they are closed through difficulties of war. In some cases local Communist-controlled governments have given subsidies to foreign missionary orphanages or hospitals to enable them to keep going.

There are, however, certain basic frictions between the new democratic governments and the Catholic missions. These have little to do with religion. They have to do chiefly with landlordism and espionage.

Let me take, first, the way in which stories are manufactured. A certain Father O'Connor, one of the chief writers of anti-Communist stories, went to Yen-an for a week when it was still under the Communists. Later at a public meeting in Peiping, he asked me whether I had visited the Catholic church in Yen-an. I replied that I had not.

"I found it occupied by soldiers, and used as a granary," he declared. "I was forced to beg for a room in a school to perform mass." He conveyed a picture of persecution and seizure.

Since I had no facts to refute him, the meeting took his tale as gospel. The same evening I repeated it to Mark Gayn, correspondent of the *Chicago Sun*, who had visited the Yen-an Catholic Church together with O'Connor. He was furious at what he called "the reverend father's lies." He stated that the only grain in the church belonged to the local priest who kept his winter grain in an unobtrusive corner. The soldiers came in for two hours during their noon rest, on invitation of the priest, as they were passing through.

Father O'Connor found the church too cold to say mass in, though the local priest had used it. He asked for a warmer room and was courteously given a school room.

The same Father O'Connor was one of a group of correspondents who interviewed Colonel Alexander, chairman of one of General Marshall's Truce Teams, about alleged atrocities against Catholics in South Hopei. The colonel stated that he had personally checked half a dozen stories and had found one case in which a priest "suffered from the Communists." The priest had been brought before a village meeting and asked to "make restitution" for lands which, the peasants claimed, the missions had got by bribing corrupt officials and seizing them from the farmers, many years ago. The priest refused, and a hot argument followed, during which he was hit on the hand by a farmer's stick so that some skin came off his knuckles.

This, said the colonel, was the only case in which he found a grain of fact. The other tales "were made out of whole cloth."

During the colonel's recital, Father O'Connor made eager notes on the bruising of the priest's knuckles, but put his pen ostentatiously aside when the colonel denied the other stories. It was clear what kind of a report he was going to write.

I have taken considerable pains to collect and check on various stories that have been going the rounds in China about friction between Chinese Communists and Catholic missions. Typically, they fall into two categories: those in which Catholic representatives are charged with having been "war criminals," and those in which there are disputes over land holdings, alleged to have been secured by the mission through force or fraud.

Some Polish priests of Singtai in South Hopei, for instance, were arrested and charged with having acted as spies for the Japanese during their mopping-up campaign against Communist guerillas in the recent war. Anyone who knows the complacent attitude of the Vatican towards Japan, and its hostile attitude

towards Communists is hardly surprised that the court found the charges true. Eight priests, in fact, admitted their guilt, in a two months' trial, attended by large crowds. The information they gave the Japanese had caused the death of more than three hundred local patriots. One defendant, headmaster of a mission secondary school, was shown to have raped nine women, four of whom were teachers under him. One of the raped teachers testified and the principal finally admitted his acts. It was also shown that the Singtai church had concealed sixty cases of munitions on its premises for a notorious puppet general.

Despite all this testimony, four of the eight confessed culprits were released and the other four held for further investigation. The four released priests were at once permitted to hold mass in the Singtai church. They found it intact, with altar, candlesticks, organ, bibles and hymnals untouched. Several times during the trial the Singtai authorities took pains to announce that the Catholic religion was not on trial. A Polish priest in the same city stated to a correspondent: "These people are not against priests or foreigners but against war criminals." The restraint of the Chinese populace, who had lost three hundred lives through the treachery of eight Polish priests, but who could refrain from blaming an innocent Polish priest, compares favorably with the way the Amercian populace treated innocent Japanese on the Pacific coast during the war.

A basic source of Communist-versus-Catholic friction is a land situation that goes back fifty years. In all of China, but especially on the borders of Mongolia, Roman Catholic missions possess large lands from which they derive a large part of their mission's support. These lands were secured by methods which a modern ethical sense hardly approves. Much of the Catholic property was forced from the Chinese government after the Boxer Rebellion, as indemnity for murdered missionaries. The blood of the martyrs became, in a very materialistic sense, the "seed of the church." The officials of the Manchu court, in giving the land to the Catholic missions, often stole it or took it by force from Chinese farmers.

The history of the Catholic lands in Inner Mongolia will never be fully known until the Vatican gives up its secrets. Some facts are, however, available to anyone. Lands which had been tribal property and on which there was a considerable population of peasants tilling without payment of rent but through a tribal permission, were conveyed to Catholic missions by the "galloping horse system," i.e. the mission got as much land as a man on horseback could gallop around in a given time. The peasants on the land at once became "feudal tenants" under the spiritual and temporal rule of the Catholic fathers. All of this happened within the past fifty years.

Catholic missions, in administering these lands—which were often very large feudal holdings—permitted no "freedom of religion." Only Catholic communicants were allowed as permanent tenants. Non-Catholics were expelled or became farmhands on the farms of Catholics.

All of this created an economic base for much friction when the Communists began their "land reform"!

Through acquisition of land the Catholic fathers became "Mongol Princes," with rights to administer the Mongol laws. There is still in Peiping an aged priest who was a full-fledged "prince of the Mongols," sitting in the tribal council of princes, and enforcing the laws and the tax collections over his mission tenantry. He added new "Christian" wrinkles to the Mongol laws. He would ride into a community on Sunday, point his riding crop at a woman who sat sewing in the sun in front of her home, and forthwith the husband would wait on the reverend father and pay a fine of "five whole dollars"—that was big money to a Mongol—for the Sabbath-breaking of his wife.

Erwin Engst, an American farm specialist working for the China Welfare Fund, came by chance on the Balgasan Catholic mission when he visited southern Suiyuan in December 1946.

"I rode for a day and a half," he told me, "and all the land I saw belonged to the Catholic fathers, or had been theirs until the land reform. It was the only good land in the region. Most of the region consists of sand dune, but between these great sand ridges lay one beautiful valley, possibly forty miles long by ten

wide. This valley had been taken by the mission as indemnity for a Catholic priest who was killed in the Boxer Rebellion."

Engst saw even fortified settlements in this valley, each with its church. They were not towns, for there were no shops or markets; but they were enclosures with high walls, inside which all tenants were required to live. The tenants found this inconvenient for the enclosed settlement had only one gate, opened late in the morning and closed early in the evening, and they could not get to their land in time for efficient work. All tenants' houses were mud hovels, but the Mission had fine brick buildings.

Five Belgian fathers lived in the area of the Balgasan Mission. Their stewards collected both taxes and rents. No persons but Catholics were permitted to be permanent tenants. The non-Catholics, who were the majority, lived as farmhands on the farms of Catholic tenants. There was thus a class division in three strata: five Catholic fathers as landlords, the Catholic tenants under them and the non-Catholic farmhands under these.

There were no Communists anywhere in this Balgasan region, but the local Mongols had set up a "democratic Mongolian People's government" which was enthusiastic for the Communist views of land reform. They had distributed land to the farmhands. They had also given the Catholic fathers "as much land as they could till." The priests had no intention of tilling any land at all and were trying to organize the Catholic tenants against the farmhands. This was not very successful for the Catholic tenants formed a minority of the population and were divided in their own opinions. The poorer ones were supporting the "land to the tiller" policy, while the richer ones wanted to keep their grip on the farmhands. Even the Catholics preferred owning their own land to having it owned by the mission.

Conditions described to me by Engst are repeated all over Inner Mongolia. They are conditions full of dynamite.

In January 1947 some of this dynamite exploded. A tale went out to the world that the Communists had massacred a Catholic community at Chungli, a city

northwest of Kalgan. Lurid details were given of "deaths by slicing" and other old-style tortures. Photographs were given out to American correspondents and doubtless appeared in American papers. Several conservative correspondents, however, refused to touch the story, considering it faked. Somewhat later the Communist Yen-an radio announced that they had investigated the story and that there had really been such a massacre, not by Communists but by a notoriously brutal warlord named Hsi, who had been a Japanese puppet and who was now serving the Kuomintang. He had massacred this Catholic community, they said, not for being Catholics, but for having taken part in a land reform.

After the Communists put out their version, the original story began to backfire, at least around Kalgan and Peiping, because so many foreigners thought well of the discipline of the Communist armies, and thought badly of General Hsi.

That Catholic mission north of Kalgan, however, is slated for trouble. I learned its general background when I was in Kalgan in September 1946, when frictions had already begun.

The Catholic diocese of Hsi Wantse, of which Chungli is part, is a big stretch of land northwest of Kalgan. Most of it was acquired after the Boxer Rebellion by the "galloping horse system." Later, the mission built churches or monasteries on two pieces of land and then simply annexed the lands lying between. In this way half a dozen Buddhist temples and hundreds of small homes were destroyed. Hsi Wantse Mission became "the biggest landlord in Chahar province," which had many big landlords. As a frontier area, the Mission had its own government and its own armed force "against bandits." It was a feudal kingdom, in which only Catholics were allowed as tenants.

In 1945 the Eighth Route Army came to the area, clearing out Japs. "We didn't know much about Catholic priests in those days," said K'e Chin-szu, chief of the Department of Public Affairs of the area around Kalgan. "We just announced that everybody might believe as he liked and that nobody should offend another because of religion. Nobody should say: 'Christians are no good,' or 'Buddhists are

no good.' In this frame of mind we also approached the Catholics, not thinking that they were any special problem."

Almost at once, however, the Catholics proved a very special problem. Complaints poured into Kalgan from villages in the Catholic diocese. "These Catholics try to overthrow the government. They fight the land reform. There are pro-Jap priests among them who got land corruptly from the Japs. What shall we do about them?"

The provincial government in Kalgan sent word to the local authorities to proceed with the policy of low rents, low interest, and "land to the tiller" in accordance with the local people's desire, but to be careful in dealing with foreigners and especially with religious organizations.

"We don't want friction with foreigners over religion," they said.

Suddenly a Belgian priest from Hsi Wantse appeared in Peiping, announcing that "the Communists are suppressing all the priests," and that he himself had been arrested. The Kalgan provincial authorities thereupon sent an investigator to the Hsi Wantse diocese to see what it was all about.

"We were surprised at the deep hate against the Catholics that we found among the people," said K'e. "This hate was not because of religion but because of the way the Catholics got land and used it. Also because they suppressed all other religions, destroying Buddhist temples as if these were of no account, and using the material to build their own temples.

"We were forced to think of Catholics as a special problem. These people have no respect for religion except for their own," said the tolerant Minister K'e!

K'e also learned why the Belgian priest

was arrested. Not for being a priest but for being pro-Jap, and having fifty-eight rifles and eighty ounces of opium in his house! The county government told him that this was against the law and asked him politely to hand it over to the authorities. The priest refused. They arrested him and held him while his premises were searched. Then they let him go and he went to Peiping, spreading the story that "the Communists are arresting all priests."

"Not a day passes," said K'e, "without those priests acting against the government." He gave me instances of priests trying to smash the Farmers' Union by telling its chairman that he would be excommunicated and burn in hell for supporting the "Land to the Tiller" program.

"There are both good and bad priests," concluded the tolerant Communist K'e. "Not all of them have the backward landlord souls of those priests at Hsi Wantse." He wanted me to know that the other large Catholic diocese, south of Kalgan, where there were few foreigners but Chinese priests were in the majority, was a different proposition entirely.

"Those are good people who even support the 'Land to the Tiller' policy and help the livelihood of the people, and oppose the civil war . . . If all the priests were like that, their prestige would not suffer at all."

One may find individual Catholic communities that do not fight the land reform. But the Catholic church as a whole is bound to oppose it. Its great number of communicants in China—which is many times the number of Protestant converts—is due very largely to the policy of wholesale conversion of communities, through ownership of the land on which they live. If the Catholic tenants once own their land, they will choose their beliefs more freely than the church desires.

THE JERSEY BUS FARE DECISION

By PETER SLAUNWHITE

THE American public school is in mortal danger. It is not only miserable teachers' pay and run down plant that keep the system gasping. The Supreme Court of the United States, on February 10, 1947, by approving reimbursement of parents paying bus fares to parochial schools, dealt the very idea behind the system a terrific blow. The implications have scarcely been considered, amid understandably greater public concern over inflated prices, anti-labor bills, and foreign policy. But if the public school is to survive, those implications must be considered—and acted on.

Neglect of the matter in the public prints (except for the day the decision was handed down) is not of course entirely a question of news value. The Catholic parochial school issue is dynamite. As the record of Congressional hearings on Federal aid to education shows, the little plain speaking that does take place in committee rooms rarely finds its way to the public eye; the press is most discreet. But it is more than time for open discussion. It is almost too late.

The case of *Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing Township* (67 S. Ct. 504) was argued at the bar of the Supreme Court last November. The issue was this: did the New Jersey Legislature act constitutionally in passing a bill that would allow reimbursement, from tax funds, of parents who had paid bus fares for the transportation of their children to public schools and Catholic parochial schools? On February 10 a majority of five Justices said yes. Speaking through Mr. Justice Black the court declared that neither the due process clause of the 14th Amendment nor the separation of church and state clause of the 1st Amendment had been violated.

With reference to due process the court took a strict constructionist view. "Changing local conditions create new local problems," it observed, "which may lead a state's people and its local authorities to believe that laws authorizing *new types of public services* are necessary to promote the general well-being of the people." Further, "it is much too late to

argue that legislation intended to facilitate the opportunity of children to get a *secular* education serves no purpose." (Italics mine—P. S.). In any case, while the court has on occasion properly interfered with legislative action, great caution must be exercised.

As for the 1st Amendment, the court did not believe that New Jersey was prohibited "from spending tax-raised funds to pay bus fares of parochial school pupils as a part of the general program under which it pays the fares of pupils attending public and other schools." The objective was safety, the avoidance of hazards incident to walking or hitchhiking, and "the benefits of public welfare legislation" should not be withheld from any parents "*because of their faith or lack of it.*" (Italics in original—P. S.). Doubtless, withholding such funds, for services "so separate and so indisputably marked off from the religious function" would make it harder to run parochial schools. But that was not the purpose of the 1st Amendment. The state contributed no money to those schools; the amendment was not violated.

This reasoning is ripped to shreds in two dissents. In the first, Mr. Justice Jackson, joined by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, ranges freely over several points. In the second, Justice Jackson, Frankfurter, and Burton concur with Mr. Justice Rutledge in a concentrated disquisition on the 1st Amendment and an analysis of fundamentals that will probably rank with the dissents of Holmes and Brandeis.

That new times bring a new conception of the government's responsibility for "general well-being" is obvious. Thanks to the court's response to new needs and public opinion about them we have obtained some measure, inadequate though it be, of social security and legal protection of labor unionism. But to stretch that principle to cover aid to parochial schools requires quite an effort. The majority therefore denies that the New Jersey law furnishes any aid to parochial schools. It refers blandly to "secular" education as though that were the whole story. And it has, unfortunately, a precedent—what

Mr. Justice Rutledge mournfully terms the first breach in the wall separating church and state. Some years ago the Louisiana Legislature appropriated money for "school books," to be distributed free to "the school children of the state." Objections were raised because the parochial schools shared the benefits. Citing the phrases in the law just quoted, Mr. Justice Hughes upheld the inclusion of the parochial schools on the ground that the legislature's intent was justified by the "public purpose" served; there was no dissent. (*Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education*, 281 US 370).

Building on this "oblique ruling"—to borrow the Rutledge vocabulary—the court undertakes to defend the thesis that (1) secular and religious instruction can be considered separately, though offered under a single roof, (2) transport to schools is a matter of public welfare having no necessary connection with the character of the institutions involved, and (3) Catholic parents should not be penalized because the tenets of their faith require that their children attend the parochial rather than the common school.

One would expect an edifice like that, exposed to air and light, to collapse of its own weight. Nevertheless, five members of our highest tribunal do think it sound. It has to be demolished piece by piece.

Consider first the notion that in a parochial school, teaching religion as well as other subjects, state aid can be regarded as support for the secular instruction alone. Why, the very combination of the two is the *raison d'être* of the parochial school; religious instruction is held more important than and fundamental to any other kind. As Mr. Justice Jackson points out, this is especially notable in the Catholic Church outlook. Hence, says he, "to render aid to its Church school is indistinguishable to me from rendering the same aid to the Church itself." Nor is the Church's own view any different. In his Encyclical of December 1929, Pope Pius XI defined as a *religious* duty the obligation of every Catholic to press the state for complete support of the parochial schools. That is of course nothing new; Mr. Justice Jackson demonstrates its basis in the canon law.

It is precisely the combination of reli-

gious and secular instruction, adds Mr. Justice Rutledge, that the 1st Amendment forbids the state to aid or interfere with. The proportions of the mixture are irrelevant. And the auspices are irrelevant—whether Catholic or Baptist, it doesn't matter.

But, protests the majority, paying these bus fares is not support of the parochial school; it is a matter of safety on highways and fair dealing with all children. Mr. Justice Rutledge replies: "transportation, where it is needed, is as essential to education as any element" and its cost cannot be abstracted from the "composite of total costs;" "that it is a substantial and a necessary element is shown most plainly by the continuing and increasing demand for the state to assume it." The safety argument is dismissed in both dissents as absurd, inasmuch as public conveyances were being used—there was no special school bus on the road. Actually, utilizing such transport might be safer than walking or hitch-hiking—the dissenters do not examine that question; but their fundamental argument is not affected thereby.

Tax aid for bus fares, they reason, if it brings the child to the school ("more safely" or otherwise) also brings the school to the child—and that school has the admixture of secular and religious instruction whose support by the state the Constitution forbids; of course it is that very admixture that moves the parents to send their children to the school in question. If a "new type of public service" is recognized here, justified by "public benefit," the logic can be extended to cover other expenses of parochial schooling. "This is not just a little case over bus fares," warns Mr. Justice Rutledge.

Actually, "public" cannot properly be applied to the matter in hand. For the 1st Amendment makes religion *private* business; that is the heart of the issue. The state can legislate for individual welfare, for collective bargaining, for social security; it can nationalize or socialize, as Mr. Justice Jackson observes. But it can do nothing "respecting an establishment of religion." Religion is private business, and the court acted accordingly in protecting the Catholic schools of the State of Washington when the legislature's in-

terpretation of "changing local conditions" and public sentiment about them would have forbidden such institutions to operate. (*Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 US 510). By the same token, if the Catholic parent wishes to exercise his religious liberty more fully than other parents by sending his child to the parochial school, he must in Mr. Justice Rutledge's language accept the fact that "by the terms of our Constitution the price" of that liberty is greater for him than for others. He *is* in a measure penalized. But he cannot complain of discrimination in law for the obvious reason that his children are welcome at the common school (and, happily, a very large proportion of them are enrolled there, despite the Church's pressure to the contrary).

Separation of church and state, and its defense against the century-old campaign for state aid by the Catholic Church, are not the only considerations reviewed by the dissenters. They note, for example, that the law could have been declared unconstitutional on the admittedly narrow ground that it provided for reimbursement of bus fare payments with reference specifically to "public" and "Catholic parochial" schools. Other religious establishments, and profit-making schools, were excluded; but no proof was advanced to support the implicit assumption that the former did not exist, and the safety argument would apply to the latter as well as to non-profit schools. Such considerations, however, carry little significance in comparison with the central issue.

The *Everson Case* decision has a direct bearing on the struggle for Federal aid to education. Bills furnishing such aid to public education have been promoted for two generations by the labor movement and a growing number of the educator-organizations; they have been blocked regularly by conservatives fearing Federal control (generally anti-New Deal minds), and by the Catholic Church. The former remain consistent in their opposition. But a wondrous transformation took place in the Church viewpoint when in 1945 a bill was introduced that gave a share of the money to "non-public schools." True, no funds could be handed to them for teachers' salaries, and Mr. Heffron of the Catholic Men told the Senate committee he regarded that as dis-

crimination against the Catholic taxpayer. A foot was in the door, however, and he was under orders to support the bill as it stood.

The tail is now wagging the dog. We have reached a point where many proponents of Federal aid throw up their hands and say, "You can get Federal aid only by surrendering to the Church's demand. Although its followers are a minority the Church is highly organized and controls decisive votes in Congress. To surrender is neither right nor democratic nor constitutional; but it must be done."

There are still some who stand by the traditional public school, the school established in New York State, by the way, against the opposition of the very able but not sufficiently powerful Archbishop John Hughes. These public school defenders are often charged with anti-Catholic prejudices. Is there any prejudice in their fight against a cut for the parochial schools? Perhaps—in the minds of a few individuals and "professional" anti-Catholics. But that is not the issue; in fact it's a red herring. The core of the problem is simply this: if the parochial schools of one group can secure any sort of aid, all will be entitled to it and stepping up for it with hands outstretched; when that happens the common school is on its way out. Lest we forget, the American people decided one hundred years ago, having had their fill of sectarian strife, that public taxes should encourage the public or "common" school alone. The decision was born of struggle—struggle against sectarians of many faiths. It is an important part of our democratic heritage. Have we forgotten it already?

It happens also, as Mr. Justice Jackson points out, that the public school, "if not a product of Protestantism, at least is more consistent with it than with the Catholic culture and scheme of values." That is a matter of record. What then? Obviously, our fellow-citizens of the Roman communion have the right to try to persuade the rest of us that Pope Pius XI was correct, that the teaching of religion is the most important part of education and that the state should support it entirely. But, equally obviously, those who prefer the philosophy of Jefferson and Madison on this subject, who prefer to strengthen the common school

as a bulwark against domestic prejudice and strife, have the right to oppose the Catholic view—without being accused recklessly of “disrespect for the cloth.”

To do so openly, to try to secure from Congress an accurate reflection of majority opinion—clearly non-Catholic, is unpopular—even dangerous. Here and there a maverick professor tells an NEA convention that a spade is a spade; the common school needs more such help. If

the court trend represented by the Everson Case decision is not reversed by public opinion we risk a decline of the common school, a shift of pupils to myriad sectarian schools, and the nourishing of group prejudice and rivalry. Pressure for sectarian schools helped produce the late but unlamented American Protective Association—a reactionary hate group—in the '80's. If it happens again we shall all share the blame.

PROTESTANTS AND THE “TITO WHITEWASH”

By CEDRIC BELFRAGE

THE Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston, has called upon “responsible Protestant leaders” to repudiate an “infamous and monstrous” document. The authors of the document are seven Protestant churchmen, led by Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, who have just returned from Yugoslavia—“seven hand-picked defenders of Tito’s war on religion,” says Cushing. The document asserts that, upon eye-witness and documentary evidence, there is complete freedom of worship in Yugoslavia.

“DECRIES VIEWS ON YUGOSLAVIA,” the *New York Sun* headlined the story. When our press dislikes facts, it calls them “views.” The press of our Protestant country, which was founded on the principle of separation of church and state, is backing Archbishop Cushing and the Vatican line almost without exception.

Cushing’s pronunciamento was, however, so clearly libelous and hysterical that within an hour or two some more prudent publishers realized they were holding a hot potato. The *New York Herald Tribune* published the story in its first edition of August 20th, together with a few lines about Rev. John Howard Melish’s (one of the party) press conference the previous day—omitting the facts on which Melish’s statements were based. In later editions the whole story was killed.

The *New York Times* began by front-paging the Cushing story, following it on an inside page with some “questions”

to the seven churchmen from Rev. Edward Lodge Curran and exactly one sentence about Melish’s “assertion.” In later editions on August 20th the story was abbreviated on page 10, and somebody realized that tying up Cushing with Curran, the “Father Coughlin of the East,” was less than judicious. A successful operation upon both Curran and Melish was hastily performed at the *Times* city desk.

Time need not be wasted here concerning our “free press” job on the Protestant investigation in Yugoslavia, except to give the *Herald Tribune* qualified commendation for printing the group’s original statement (in one edition—later yanked) and for its interview with Dr. Shipler on the 21st. The interview left out some of the key facts: for example, that Shipler had in his office a pile of prayerbooks and Roman Catholic literature printed by the Yugoslav government for the church, and the documentation against Stepinac and the other quisling priests which, to describe it very modestly, is overwhelming.

Not the libelousness (which we should have expected) but the hysteria of the hierarchy is the matter of vital interest to Protestants who still believe their church can save its soul.

The hierarchy has been touched on its rawest spot. It cannot factually rebut the evidence of the crimes by hundreds of Roman Catholic clergymen, from archbishops to priests, friars and nuns, in Pavelic’s “Independent State of Croatia.” Much of the evidence, which is set out soberly and at length in the Yugoslav

Embassy's publication *The Case of Archbishop Stepinac*, is from their own "religious" newspapers published between 1941 and 1944.

We can read in this booklet, if our stomachs are strong, the documentation about the massacre of 800,000 Christian and Jewish anti-fascists by their "brother" Roman Catholics with the most complete support of the hierarchy; about Roman Catholic priests slitting the throats of Serbian Orthodox priests; about nuns and friars holding a cross in one hand and an Ustashi knife in the other; about a priest instructing his flock from the pulpit to "first kill my sister who is married to a Serb, and then all Serbs"; about mass conversion forced upon village people who, even if they "accepted," were then sometimes massacred with rifles and hammers; about the boxes of gold teeth, watches and other loot from Ustashi murder victims buried under the monastery floor next to Stepinac's residence, with a document by Stepinac acknowledging their receipt. And all this adorned with photographs of quivering clergy chumming with Wehrmacht generals and convicted murderers like Pavelic.

In the Croatian Catholic press Archbishop Saric states:

"European missions! World missions! They will be upheld not by priests but by army commanders led by Hitler."

Or by Editor-priest Franjo Kralik:

"The movement for freeing the world from the Jews is a movement for the renaissance of human dignity. The Almighty and All-wise God is behind the movement."

Or by the Roman Catholic paper *Nedelja* (June 1941):

"The German soldier showed us that even a soldier can be a gentleman . . . They always behaved in a fine and noble manner like their leaders."

And we can read the message of an eminent and spiritually tormented Croat Roman Catholic to Stepinac:

"Not one Bishop has decried the fate of the innocent Christian Serbs who have suffered more than the Jews in Germany . . . I write you this . . . to save my soul, and

I leave it to you to find a way to save your soul."

Because Yugoslavia is what it is today, Stepinac—who by an almost incredible act of generosity was given four months to save his body by moving it out of the country—will have to do his soul-saving in jail, where he has nothing else to do except read, write and conduct masses.

But it should be pointed out that statements of exactly the same kind as the above were made in Roman Catholic pulpits and publications in Nazi Germany, and that were Stepinac in that country under American, British or French jurisdiction he would today be continuing in office and held up as a model to the religious masses. Becoming desperate in the later years because he needed loot and the hierarchy did not "give," Hitler undertook some persecution of a mild sort against the Roman Catholic empire in Germany; and this—although the entire hierarchy blessed Hitler's "holy war," and some even joined the SS—is enough for us to classify them as Nazi "victims." But Pavelic's Croatia and Tiso's Slovakia show what the true relations were and still are between fascism and the Vatican.

It should further be pointed out and constantly repeated that the record of the Protestant leadership in Hitler's "new Europe" was little, if any, better. They took the same line as Stepinac described in a talk with a British liaison officer 18 months before his trial (published in the *New Statesman & Nation*, London):

"I and those of my priests who collaborated with the Germans did so because the issue in the war was a clear one, between Fascism and Communism. I chose the former while Britain chose the latter . . . The peasants will one day rise, and I look to the West to use its atomic power to impose Western civilization."

The religious persecution that went on before Tito, the crimes of Stepinac and his cut-throat friends, and the present freedom of worship in Yugoslavia under the American system of church-state separation, have been so clearly established by the Protestant delegation (who were neither "hand-picked" nor tools of anyone) that Cushing's blast is, indeed, a challenge to every responsible Protestant leader. It

is a challenge that cannot be dodged as others have been in the past. Protestant leaders are compelled to take sides positively either for or against fascism, for or against truth, for or against church-state separation, for or against religion.

Their actions in the immediate future concerning the Yugoslav issue will demonstrate, once and for all, where these leaders stand.

"For once in my life I have seen religion applied. The freedom of institutional religion to worship anywhere is a symbol. In the constructive unity of people of all religious groups building the Yugoslav five-year plan, I have seen a great religious revival in action."

Such is the summation of what he saw in Yugoslavia by the Rev. Claude Williams, director of the People's Institute of Applied Religion at Birmingham, Ala., and one of the seven-minister delegation.

"I took my Bible along to measure these things by the Word," said Williams. Taking a worn Testament from his pocket he flipped the pages with his thumb. "The Yugoslav five-year plan is a religious program to feed the hungry and clothe the naked—a shocking factor to nominal Christians. The spirit in which it is being carried through is that of a voluntary will to work, a determination to rebuild and build anew, and a conviction that there must be no more war."

I have talked with other members of the group and found in them the same extraordinary fervor. The fervor is not political but religious, and, as the statement signed by all members of the party shows, has nothing to do with their individual sympathy, or lack of it, with the political left as such.

The most striking evidence and symbol of the religious spirit among the people is the "Brotherhood Highway" under construction between Belgrade (Orthodox Serbia) and Zagreb (Catholic Croatia). These two centers have for generations stood in isolation bristling with "religious" hostility against one another. Foreign powers occupying or dominating the Bal-

kans have done their utmost to keep it that way. Now at last a highway between them is being built by tens of thousands of singing volunteers of all faiths.

Then there is the "Youth Railroad" project, on which are working 80,000 volunteers from every country in the world except the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., and the volunteer housing projects carried out by trade unionists and their wives and children.

"My experience and observations," Williams sums up, "lead to the conclusion that there is a deep unity among the people in all walks of life. This unity grows out of a complete and general disillusionment about all superimposed leadership whether political, economic or religious. The disillusionment grew out of a people's struggle against an invading enemy and their internal collaborators."

The Rev. Father Curran has asked Melish to identify the documents proving "the guilt of Catholic clergy of Yugoslavia of offenses against the people." He could be confident that the respectable press is on his side and would never print the facts in the documents. In any case, it is open to doubt whether for Curran "offenses against the people" includes torturing and massacring them when they happen not to be Roman Catholics.

It may, however, be mentioned that the documents brought home by the group implicates not merely Catholic clergy in Yugoslavia but also a certain Francis Spellman, the Pope's most important representative outside the Vatican. Spellman, who could not possibly have been unaware of the crimes in Croatia any more than Stepinac was, recorded his intention in 1941 to try and persuade President Roosevelt of the virtues of Pavelic's Croatia, which he regarded as a model Christian state.

There is an Iron Curtain around Yugoslavia and it has been drawn in America. The hierarchy know that their whole destiny depends on preventing the truth from coming out.

SLAVS UNITE FOR PEACE

By BOZHIDAR MILOSEVICH

THE largest racial family in Europe is of Slav origin, Russian, Ukrainian, Czech-Slovak, Polish, Yugoslav (Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Macedonian) and Bulgarian. These people are one linguistically as well as culturally. A Russian or a Ukrainian will much more easily understand a Czech or a Serb than an Italian will understand another member of the Latin family, a Frenchman for instance. And all Slavs take pride in Tolstoy, Gorky, Dostoyevsky, Sinkievicz, Chopin, Tesla, Lenin, Hus, Smetana, Boskovic, Dvorshak, Masaryk, Tchaikowski, Polasek, Njegush, Gundulich, Presern and so on and so on.

Such a family of peoples could not but try to form an inter-Slav union. A few protagonists of that union have been Jan Kolar, a Slovak; Vaclav Hanka, a Czech; Michievicz, a Pole; Shevchenko, a Ukrainian; Kirievsky, a Russian; Vasil Aprilov, a Bulgarian; Juraj Krizanich, a Croatian; Vuk Karadzich, a Serbian; Stanko Vraz a Slovenian. All these, thinking in terms of Slav brotherhood have been interested in bringing together the various Slav nations into one union. Because Russia was the biggest and strongest Slav sister, most of these exponents of the Pan-Slav movement visualized the new unified Slavdom under the protection of the Czar. This idea of Russian protection still lives today and is stronger than ever because of the defeat of the Nazis by the Red Army. Nazism was only a development of Pan-Germanism which had always threatened the existence of the Slavs. The Master Race of Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Rosenberg, was no new thing to the Slavs.

At any rate it was quite logical for the Slavs to unite against this master race idea and there can be little doubt that if it had not been for the Slavs the average pan-Germans would have enslaved not only Europe but Asia, Africa, Australia and America herself. It would be wrong to underestimate the part played in the war by the sentiment of pan-Slavism and it would be wrong now to underestimate the sentiment of Slavic affinity in the post-war movement of the Slavs towards

mutual understanding and solidarity in the face of a world which apparently has not yet decided on peace. After World War I all movements of the Slavic peoples towards mutual understanding were thwarted by Austro-German influences. True, after the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian empire, three Slav brothers came into their own as sovereign states: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia. But something went wrong within each of those states, so that they could not conciliate their brotherly differences. Powers that were interested in those differences knew well how to keep them alive and to fan them into open quarrelling with each other.

Czechoslovakia was split between the Czechs whose liberal progressive spirit was unacceptable to the conservative Slovaks who fell under the spell of Father Hlinka's Slovak Party. While the late Thomas G. Masaryk was planning a liberal Czechoslovakia and hoping that the Slovaks would come along, the Roman Catholic majority in the Slovak part of the state preferred to follow Father Hlinka who recently paid the death penalty for his collaboration with the Nazis. It was the same story in Yugoslavia. The Serbs, having once a nation in their own right, felt reluctant to consider themselves equal with the Croats and the Slovenes who had lived so long under the Hapsburg sceptre. The Croats looked down on the Serbs' "inferior" culture and indulged in their ancient dream of resurrecting the old Kingdom of Tomislav for Croatia. The Slovenes were more or less inclined to go along with the Serbs but found this impossible owing to the fact that they adhered to Western Catholicism whereas the Serbs were Orthodox. Poland enjoyed internal peace from a nationalistic point of view, but during the period between World War I and II they were betrayed into a servile dependence upon the Papacy. This was the chief reason why they fell so easily before the Nazi hordes.

The Bulgarians also fell into the net of the Nazis but it is well-known that it was impossible to use Bulgarian soldiers

against their brother Slavs of the Red Army.

Throughout World War II there has been a growing realization on the part of these Slav nations that their destiny is one. But today it is no longer correct to say that their primary thought is nationalistic or even racial in any exclusive sense. They know better than that. The basis of their brotherhood is something far more important than their common Slav inheritance. They are thinking of themselves, yes, but only as an integral part of one world of peace and abundance. The Slavs are possessed of a messianic conviction that they are pioneers in the world march to peace. Within their nations they have renounced the idea of the welfare of an individual at the expense of other individuals. Likewise they renounce the idea of the welfare of individual nations at the expense of other nations. It is true that they began by making treaties with one another. The Poles have made an amicable treaty with the Soviet Union. The Bulgarians have cemented their

friendship with the Yugoslavs. Some of our commentators of press and radio are jumping to the conclusion that the Russians are building a Slav bloc which threatens the peace of the world. Many of these commentators are paid to see RED no matter how constructively and openly the Slavs behave. The Yugoslav Jan Maslarich has put the case of the new inter-Slav movement when, as president of the All-Slav Committee which recently met in Moscow, he said: "The pacts and treaties which have been made among the Slavs and others are dictated primarily by the interests of universal peace and international security. They reflect the spirit and the aims of the Slav peoples who by strengthening their brotherly union would make impossible any repetition of the German aggression in the future . . . the Slav people are foremost in battling the remnants of fascism. In developing their New Slavdom they have but one goal: to create a true friendly inter-Slav brotherhood which, in turn, will cement friendship with all the peace-loving nations of the world . . ."

FRANCE MUST CHOOSE

By M. PAUL

FRANCE is now at the crossroads again, just as she was at the time of Munich. Daladier has been replaced by Ramadier, merely a difference of spelling. He is not selling his country to Germany this time, but is providing Germany with a unique chance of conquering it once more. For what does the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, and all that mumbo-jumbo mean to France in plain language? 1) France is going to be held by the American trusts. If the French government does not know what that means, they may ask any South American. It means retaining your flag, but losing everything else. 2) Germany will be rearmed, or at least equipped with everything that is needed for waging a successful war. Against whom? Couldn't the German army face the wrong way again, and prefer life in Paris to death at Stalingrad?

By giving France away to the American trusts, Ramadier will not be bringing any coal to France. But he will be running the risk of seeing French culture crushed and smothered by foreign habits, foreign advertising, foreign magazines, and a foreign way of life.

Almost twenty centuries ago, all Gaul was conquered by Caesar. But at least the Roman conquest brought with it the Greco-Latin culture. Compared with Julius Caesar, what has Harry Truman to offer? France has to be herself, entirely, or else be merely a country the size of Minnesota, with a population one-tenth of China's. A country of slight importance, if it is to lose its soul, accept Hollywood fashions, Ohio wines, and *Time Magazine*, *European Edition*.

But all this need not matter very much to Marshal Marshall. What he needs is a base, in order to fight the victors of

Stalingrad, those who were seeking to rid us of Hitler forever. For this, will he trust the French Republic, even Ramadier style? Or will he demand that the sceptre be given to a French Franco or Peron, a French Chiang Kai-shek or a French Tsaldaris? Ramadier may have on his side, to support his own Daladier policy in France, but one-tenth of the French population. But that tenth is the richest, and they think they hold the strings. A new Cagoulard conspiracy has been discovered, but the Ramadier government refuses to give the names of the most important men at the head of the plot, and only those of a few antiquated generals are permitted to be published as a sop to public curiosity. Up to now Ramadier may count on the chiefs of the police and of the army, but the civil servants of his own administration are against him. Most of them disapprove of his foreign policy, and all of them, of course, dread his *plan de misère*, his blueprint for semi-starvation, which will leave a decent meal available only to the very rich.

For the first time in her history, France is being treated in a manner known hitherto only to the populations south of the Rio Grande, but to them well known indeed. Will the Marshall Plan succeed, for a while? Or will it bring France again to the heroic days of the French Revolution?

France is tired, immensely tired, and requires and passionately desires peace, inside and outside. She knows that years are needed to recuperate. She had wanted to feel her way towards social progress, and not to have to make a choice at once between the two extreme doctrines, that of American reaction and that of Russian Bolshevism. Now the necessity of a choice presents itself to her, prematurely. Middle-of-the-road parties should have

been allowed to play their part for a while, before a final choice need be arrived at. Now the necessity of an immediate decision is brutally flung in France's face. The so-called Socialist Party, after effecting a violent swing to the right, to please Truman, is losing its labour following at an astonishing rate. The Communist Party is gaining accordingly and almost in the same proportion as the Socialists are losing. The time of decision is approaching.

If Ramadier decides against all French interests, will the French army fight the Third World War in the steppes of Russia, shoulder to shoulder with the hated Germans? Those who count on that must be warned that except for those of the collaborationists who have not yet been hanged, hatred of Germany is almost unanimous in France. Humiliations, oppressions and tortures have not been forgotten in two years. The forces of the Resistance would rise again. President Truman, or at least those specialists among his circle of counsellors who are advising him so mistakenly, should be told that a German alliance for France is unthinkable.

Something else that he ought to know concerns the often vaunted German morale. People all over western Europe remember very vividly the sudden pallor that blanched the round faces of the German soldiery, whenever the orders came through that sent them to the Eastern Front. They grant that it may be only too easy for American dollars to re-equip the German army, but they profoundly doubt whether, once supplied with the necessary weapons, that army will choose to face east. And they believe that once it faces west, America may bitterly regret having armed them so well.

FRITCHMAN AND UNITARIAN LIBERALISM

Letter to Frederick May Eliot

July, 13, 1947

Dear Dr. Eliot:

The June issue of the *Christian Register* is named Western Conference number, with a Chicago minister as Guest Editor. But I think that for many, as for me, it is Stephen Fritchman number, and I am disappointed that it gives such scanty information about what caused the trouble.

For all the space given the case in this issue the facts are left unrevealed—intentionally one may be quite sure. In your own article on Mr. Fritchman you laud him for “extraordinary ability, devotion to the cause of liberal religion.” You say he is among the ablest of religious editors, that under his leadership the *Register* became a leader in the field. In your letter to Dr. Bucke you affirm unchanging loyalty to the principle of a free religious press. You affirm the *Register* has been that and will continue to be. You offer what you call “a clear and dispassionate statement of the events” that brought about the crisis and the ouster of Editor Fritchman. Instead your statement gives a meager account completely lacking in essential details. All that is made clear is that the Advisory Board objected to something that the editor had written and had duly submitted in conference. He and the Board seem to have insisted with equal tenacity, he that it be printed, they that it be killed.

The result was that Editor Fritchman was relieved of responsibility for the May issue. The Chairman of the Advisory Board, aided by some unnamed AUA officials took charge. The editorial was “sunk without trace.” So far as I can learn it was not quoted at all in the Annual Meeting. It does not appear in this “Fritchman number” of the *Register*.

At this Annual Meeting a resolution to restore Mr. Fritchman to his place as Editor was defeated by a *voice vote*, a device that allows a strong voice to outweigh several quieter voices, which may or may not have had effect on the result. You express hope that Unitarians will have “confidence in the fairmindedness, balance, competence and liberalism” of this decision. This seems to me a heavy demand to make on such scanty objective evidence. WHY wasn’t the editorial itself submitted to those who attended the meeting, that they might judge whether or not objection to it was reasonable or not? Why were the objections of the Advisory Board not stated? If the Advisory Board was set up to be in fact nothing more than that by whose authority was it transformed into a Board of Censorship? How can you reconcile the fact of such a Board, nominally Advisory but actually having power superior to that of the Editor, with your remarks of editorial freedom, “which we have and shall continue to have” to paraphrase slightly your letter to Dr. Bucke.

All that the several articles in this number tell us is that the “Advisory Board” found Mr. Fritchman “uncooperative,” apparently because he ventured to assert editorial freedom. This is exactly the freedom you assert he had. Yet upon trying to exercise such freedom he found it wasn’t there.

Omission of the editorial from all the discussion, omission of any statement of the Advisory Board of why they felt obliged to censor it, seem to me objectionable and significant. Even Mr. Fritchman, in his statement read to the meeting and which is printed in this issue of the *Register* tells nothing of what was in the editorial, not even its subject. There must be a reason for this reticence. Can it be that those in control of the discussion thought the matter “too hot” for full debate? If such “discretion” was the motive for leaving out the essential facts you must expect many will call the policy of evasion and silence by a worse name than ‘discretion.’

An editorial in the April-May number of THE PROTESTANT magazine offers a possible clew to an explanation of the eagerness of AUA high officialdom to suppress unfavorable comment on the Truman declaration of war upon Communism—at home and abroad. (I am assuming the truth of the rumors that the editorial criticised the

March 12th statement of our President of his intention to intervene in Greece and Turkey justifying such action in Greece by saying the Resistance there was Communist-led, fully warranting our intervention. The statement continued that "Communism in control in any country is a menace to our security"—quoting inexactly.

I presume you have read THE PROTESTANT editorial mentioned. It is entitled Traps for the Unwary. You and Mr. Greely, AUA Secretary, are listed among those actively promoting the traps described, organizations meant to enlist the cooperation of "the middle classes," those of "fixed incomes, beneficiaries of institutions, people of modest savings and thrift" etc. The plan of the three allied and associated groups named is to enlist the cooperation of all these gullible persons to join in opposition to "the encroaching power of labor" which is pictured as matching Capital in greed. Of course John Foster Dulles is in the picture. The announced objects are quite in line with his ideas, from all angles, anti-labor, anti-Communist, anti-Soviet, and are true to his first loyalty, organized Big Capital—"Institutions" in this literature.

Finding you and Mr. Greely listed as among the promoters of what Mr. Leslie correctly calls Traps for the Unwary suggests reasons for the stern repressive action taken on the Fritchman editorial. It is most unpleasant to be driven by the evasiveness shown in the accounts offered in the *Register*, the professions of editorial freedom as a cherished ideal scrupulously cherished contradicted by the plain facts in the case and finally by the revelations of THE PROTESTANT editorial to unpleasant and unwelcome conclusions about some at least of the Unitarian leadership. But there seems no way of avoiding such conclusions.

C. H. COYLE

CAN THIS BE TRUE?

Mr. Hill makes one sensational charge that would seem to call for a little attention from one of those Congressional investigating committees that abound in Washington.

"The biggest scandal [he writes] was the methodical looting. I do not refer to looting by individual soldiers during combat. . . . I am talking about the people, ranging from delegates to the Potsdam Conference down through colonels and majors to private soldiers, who sent back whole libraries, sets of costly china, silver, anything of value in the houses that had been requisitioned for them. The Army [the U. S. Army, that is] encouraged this kind of loot. . . ."

And then comes the real shocker!

"The Kronberg jewel theft was a dramatic story, but it came out only because there was nobody higher than a colonel involved. Other scandals of this type, if they had been revealed, would have touched men in such high places that there would have been international repercussions."

If our perspiring Federal legislators really want to get their teeth into something during the current fever for war investigating, Mr. Hill, it seems to me, is their man.

From William L. Shirer's review of "Struggle for Germany" by Russell Hill (Harper and Bros.) in the N. Y. Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review, Aug. 24, 1947.